

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found, for example, in the specification as filed at paragraphs [0010] and [0013]. No new matter has been added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments:

(a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Ma in the January 7, 2009, interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claim 13 contains allowable subject matter.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Claims 1-7, 9 and 12

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,597,413 ("Kurashina") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,371 ("Hirabayashi"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,017 ("Shimomaki"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,777,973 ("Morishita"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office Action, at page 6, acknowledges that Kurashina, Hirabayashi, and Shimomaki do not teach that the capacitor wire, the electrodes forming the exterior circuit connection terminals, and the relay electrode all are formed of a same material, as required in claim 1. The Office Action alleges that Morishita, at column 6, lines 50-58, remedies this deficiency. However, Morishita merely describes that a metal film of Al, Cr, Ta, Ti, Mo or the like may be used to form cross line 5. Nowhere does Morishita describe a relay electrode specifically, or that a relay electrode must be formed of a same material as the capacitor wire and the electrodes forming the exterior circuit connection terminals. Morishita, like the other cited references, in fact makes no restriction on the similarity or difference in materials used to form the relay electrode, the capacitor wire and the electrodes forming the exterior circuit connection terminals. Therefore, it is clear that Morishita does not teach relay electrodes at all, much less that relay electrodes must be formed of the same material as the capacitor wire and the electrodes forming the exterior circuit connection terminals, as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, claim 1 recites that the capacitor wire, the electrodes of the exterior circuit connection terminals and the relay electrode are each formed of a same material and in a same film. One of ordinary skill in the art of displays and electro-optical devices would understand this to mean that the capacitor wire, the electrodes of the exterior circuit connection terminals and the relay electrode are all formed in the same process. Components formed in the same film are those formed by a manufacturing process in which solid films for both the electrodes and the capacitor wire are formed at the same time and are then processed by predetermined patterning treatment (including, for example, photolithographic and etching steps) at the same time. See the specification, paragraph [0013].

With the electrodes and capacitor wire formed on the same layer of the laminate structure, there is no necessity for a wire extending from the electrode forming the exterior circuit connection terminal and connecting, via a contact hole, to the capacitor electrode

forming the storage capacitor in the image display region or to the wire supplying predetermined potential to the capacitor electrode. By alleviating the necessity for this wire, unwanted images, caused by contact holes having irregular properties, can be suppressed.

The PTO has previously alluded to possibly being able to interpret the term "film" as describing the entire multi-layered structure comprising a matrix of thin film transistors. Clearly, from the discussion above, this would not coincide with the understanding of one of ordinary skill in the art.

None of Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, and Morishita describe an electro-optical device wherein the capacitor wire, the electrodes of the exterior circuit connection terminals and the relay electrode are each formed of a same material and in a same film. Neither do any of Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, and Morishita provide any reason or rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to have attempted such an electro-optical device, as recited in claim 1, and fail to suggest the benefits described above that arise from forming the capacitor wire, the electrodes of the exterior circuit connection terminals and the relay electrode of a same material and in a same film. Therefore, none of Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, and Morishita render claim 1 obvious.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, none of Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, or Morishita, whether read independently or in concert, render obvious claims 1-7, 9 and 12. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claim 8

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kurashina in view of Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, Morishita, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0102903 ("Kim"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, and Morishita fail to render obvious independent claim 1. Thus, these references also fail to render obvious dependent claim 8.

The Office Action alleges that Kim teaches a capacitor wire having a multi layer structure, but Kim fails to remedy the deficiencies of the other references discussed above. Thus, Kim also fails to render obvious claim 8.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, Morishita, and Kim fail to render obvious claim 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. Claim 10

The Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kurashina in view of Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, Morishita, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0202800 ("Matsushima"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, and Morishita fail to render obvious claim 10. Additionally, Matsushima fails to remedy the deficiencies of the other cited references.

Therefore, none of Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, Morishita, and Matsushima render obvious claim 10. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

D. Claim 11

The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, Morishita, and U.S. Patent No. 6,480,244 ("Murade"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, and Morishita also fail to render obvious claim 11. Additionally, Murade fails to remedy the deficiencies of the other cited references.

Therefore, none of Kurashina, Hirabayashi, Shimomaki, Morishita, and Murade render obvious claim 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-13 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Christopher A. Fasel
Registration No. 59,204

JAO:CAF/can

Date: January 23, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461 |
|--|